

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Robert M. Dow, Jr.	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	10 C 4257	DATE	10/26/2012
CASE TITLE	Second Amendment Arms et al. vs. City of Chicago et al.		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

For the reasons stated below, Plaintiffs' motion for extension of time [95] is stricken as moot.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Docketing to mail notices.

STATEMENT

The Court set an October 16, 2012 deadline for Plaintiffs to file an amended complaint if they desired to do so. [85, 86]. Plaintiffs filed neither an amended complaint nor a motion for extension of time in which to do so by that date, however. Instead, on October 17, 2012, Plaintiffs filed a notice of motion for extension of time [90] and a "motion for extension of time" that was identical in substance to the accompanying notice. [89]. The Court pointed out Plaintiffs' filing error at an October 18, 2012 status hearing, and Plaintiffs orally apprised the Court and Defendants of the substantive contents of the motion they had intended to file.

After giving Defendants an opportunity to respond on the record, and Plaintiffs an opportunity to clarify the duration of their requested extension, the Court granted Plaintiffs' improperly filed motion and extended the relevant filing deadline from October 16, 2012 to December 17, 2012. [92]. Plaintiffs averred that they would correct their filing error, and with this motion [95] appear to have done so. Indeed, the notice of motion filed concurrently with this motion [97] states that the motion was "intended to be filed October 16, 2012."

The instant motion serves the purpose of clarifying the record but does not seek relief beyond that already granted on October 18, 2012. The Court therefore strikes as moot the instant motion for extension of time [95].



Courtroom Deputy
Initials:

TBK